



The Faith and Free Press

Vol. 13

Published monthly in the interest of
the historic faith and freedom of Southern BaptistsNo. 6
1957

NO DETAILED AUDIT FOR N. C. BAPTIST BOOKS

When and if N. C. Baptists are given an auditor's statement as to whether any state convention funds were used in connection with the North Rocky Mount Church case, it might be well for them to be given a complete audit of the convention's financial records. For, actually, *a detailed audit of the complete records has not been made* (at least, not for some years)—only a "balance sheet" audit!

Here is the official statement as given by A. T. Allen & Company, Certified Public Accounts, in the 1955 N. C. *Baptist Annual* (p. 165):

"According to your instructions, we have audited the books and records of the Convention for the twelve months ended December 31, 1955, and in the following tabulations we show the Revenue and Expenses of the General Fund, together with all cash receipts and disbursements of the other funds. The statements of the institutions and agencies were prepared from reports sent in by these institutions and **not audited by us**.

"All cash receipts were found promptly deposited in the bank and disbursements were supported by cancelled checks, invoices, etc., with expenses properly classified. Our examination did not disclose any evidence of irregularities and we believe the funds have been carefully and honestly handled and properly accounted for.

"Just below is a summary, **not audited**, prepared from the reports of the various institutions showing the total of all income for convention objects for the calendar year: . . . (emphasis supplied)."

Similarly, in the 1956 annual (p. 156), the check-up of the book is said to be subject to the following qualification: "The funds shown as sent direct are taken from reports received by the Convention **and not otherwise verified by us**" (emphasis supplied).

In order to see more clearly just how incomplete is the audit that is made of the books of the N. C. State Convention, the above statements of the auditors should be compared with the following statement from the same auditing firm concerning the detailed audit of the Woman's Missionary Union of N. C.:

"As instructed by your Executive Committee, we have audited the books and records of the Woman's Missionary Union of Raleigh, North Carolina, for the twelve months ended December 31, 1956, and submit herewith our report.

"EXHIBITS AND SCHEDULES

"We have prepared nine Exhibits and three Schedules, as enumerated in the Index, and they are attached hereto as a part of this report to show the results of our audit.

"SCOPE OF EXAMINATION

"Cash receipts letters, supporting monies remitted to your Treasurer, Mrs. Brasher, were test-checked for the months under audit. All cash receipts entered on the books were traced to deposits made in the approved depository. We also reconciled monthly bank statements of the depository for the twelve months with records of the Treasurer, and cash in the bank as of December 31, 1956, is set forth in Schedule—1.

"Cash disbursements were test-checked for the twelve months under consideration and were found to be in the regular course of business and properly supported by cancelled checks, invoices, etc. We also ascertained that disbursements were properly distributed to the various funds.

"Our audit of the cash did not disclose any irregularities and we believe all funds have been carefully and honestly handled and accounted for.

"SUMMARY OF FUND BALANCES

"The following is a summary of the cash balances in the various funds as of December 31, 1956. Details of the transactions entering into these balances are shown in the Exhibits hereto attached for the respective funds

"GENERAL COMMENTS

"We found the books and records in balance and accurately kept. Bank accounts were reconciled monthly and trial balances taken regularly by the Treasurer.

(Continued Inside)

James M. Bulman,
Editor

I. W. Rogers,
Associate Editor

The Faith and Free Press

Subscription Rate:

\$2.00 per year

\$5.00 for three years

Official Organ of the "COMMITTEE FOR BAPTIST CHURCH AUTONOMY, INC."

Security Bank Building, High Point, N. C.

"I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints." Jude 3. (ASV.)

"Stand fast therefore in the Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Galatians 5:1 (A.V.)

"WE HEREBY CERTIFY that we have audited the books and records of the Woman's Missionary Union of Raleigh, North Carolina, for the twelve months ended December 31, 1956, and, in our opinion, the within statements show the receipts and disbursements for the twelve months ended at that time correctly classified according to information and explanations given us and as shown by the books" (from the W. M. U. Annual Reports, 1955-1956, pp. 29-30).

If a detailed audit is made of the W. M. U. records, why should not a detailed audit (instead of a mere "balance sheet" audit) be made of the books of the state convention — especially since the W. M. U. handles only around forty thousand dollars annually, whereas the state convention handles over four million dollars annually?

There is a rumor that Dr. M. A. Huggins, General Secretary and Treasurer of the N. C. State Convention, will resign. Information has been received to the effect that considerable difficulty has been experienced in recent months in obtaining funds sufficient for the full operation of the convention. At least it is certain that the one language that is understood by those in the state convention leadership is the language of dollars and cents, and that if the time has come when Dr. Huggins can no longer produce financially, his days as General Secretary and Treasurer are numbered.

But when and if the time should come for Dr. Huggins' resignation, would it not be well for the financial records of his administration to be given a detailed audit? Regardless as to whether state convention funds were used in connection with the Rocky Mount case, would it not simply be a matter of good business for a detailed audit to be given for an administration which recently has been handling over four million dollars annually? And, since the question of funds for the Rocky Mount case has been raised, would not supporters of Dr. Huggins be all the more anxious for a detailed investigation to be made of his books—so that he could retire with such honor as to silence all questioning concerning the use of funds in his administration?

In January of this year, the General Board issued a resolution expressing "complete confi-

dence" in Dr. Huggins and other officers of the state convention "in view of allegations and innuendo by certain dissidents" within the state convention 'impugning the integrity, honesty, character and ability' of Huggins and the other leaders" (Associated Press, Jan. 15). This came after Dr. C. K. Rand had challenged the board to open its books, saying:

"If you think that I don't know what I'm talking about when I say that I know that certain cooperative program funds have been used in connection with this case, then open the books, and prove me a liar!" Rand issued this challenge in spite of what had been written by the Rev. Woodrow Bulard, when he was president of the board, that "no amount has been paid to any group in connection with this case."

For any who might be in doubt about the matter, can the board's "vote of confidence" really serve as a substitute for an actual investigation of the financial records?

Dr. Huggins has stated in a letter: "I was asked to recommend to our General Board that the Convention aid in paying the attorney's fees in connection with the trial. I refused to do this." It is to be hoped that Dr. Huggins can harmonize his financial records with more apparent consistency than he has shown regarding some statements of basic doctrinal principle. He had written a number of years ago, in a book entitled, *North Carolina for Christ*, the following: "When, therefore, these churches joined forces they did not surrender, and do not now surrender, any of their autonomy." Yet he declared as a witness in the North Rocky Mount Church trial: "I do not agree with the statement that when Baptist churches join forces they do not surrender any of their autonomy" (Supreme Court of North Carolina, No. 95, Second District, Fall Term, 1954, p. 147, emphasis supplied). He gave under oath this explanation of how his testimony was to be understood in reference to what he

had previously written: "I did not mean what I said when I wrote that" (Court Record, as cited, p. 147, emphasis supplied). Yet in the letter above referred to he declared, regarding what he had written in his book about a church being completely autonomous,

"When I wrote that statement in the little booklet, North Carolina for Christ, some fifteen years ago I did mean what I said . . ." (emphasis original).

Furthermore, would it not be for the best to have a detailed audit so that the successor to Dr. Huggins could begin his administration with all such matters completley cleared up—so that no troublesome question marks will return to haunt his work in the future?

(J. M. B.)

Dr. C. K. Rand has announced that the Peoples Missionary Baptist Church, of High Point, N. C., of which he has been pastor since its organization a few months ago, will seek affiliation with the Baptist Bible Fellowship (whose official organ is the *Baptist Bible Tribune*, of which Mr. Noel Smith is editor).

Because of this decision, Dr. Rand has submitted his resignation as General Secretary of the Committee For Baptist Church Autonomy, Inc., since the Committee has sought to carry on its work within Southern Baptist Convention ranks.

While wishing Dr. Rand well in his new venture, naturally we regret that he has come to this decision—not only because this decision means a departure from what has been one of our fundamental policies, namely, that of working within the S. B. C., but also because his leaving will mean such a serious loss to our group. It is no exaggeration to say that the loss of Dr. Rand to the Autonomy Committee is as serious as was the loss of General Jackson to the Confederacy.

The decision to leave the S. B. C. on the part of one of such denominational background as Dr. Rand (he having served for seven years on the Home Mission Board) will, in the minds of many, raise more acutely than heretofore the question as to just what is the right course to pursue in regard to the objectionable conditions existing within the S. B. C. The "middle course" which the Autonomy Committee has followed has brought forth sharp criticism from certain quarters. An example of such criticism is the following, voiced several months ago by a South Carolina pub-

lication which is extremely critical of the S. B. C., the *Baptist Bible Trumpet*:

" . . . inconsistency is seen in the avowed purpose of our brethren in North Carolina to fight for the 'right' of a Baptist Church to 'withdraw,' and yet they condemn 'withdrawning' as wrong.

"Why fight for something that is wrong? Who wants the 'right' to withdraw unless you want to withdraw? To fight for that right means the brethren feel they may need to use that right in withdrawing — and this surely is an admission that withdrawing is right in some cases. But, they want time to fight on the inside.

"How much time? Ten years? No, they want their whole life so their pension and prestige, etc. will be safeguarded. If the brethren had as much offered them on the other side of the issue, I dare say, they could see a little easier that 'withdrawning' is right after all!"

We are planning to run an extended defense of our position in a future issue. Since such thoughts as expressed in the article just quoted are no doubt in many minds at present, however, it might be well to state briefly one point of consideration. To this writer, it seems very unwise simply to surrender our institutions to those who would do away with their Baptistic — and in some respects, Christian — basis. Then, too, we ought to feel an obligation to the great number of Baptists who have gone before, whose labor laid the foundations of so many of these institutions. It would be tragic to allow these institutions, paid for at so great a price, to be transformed from Baptist institutions into something else without putting up a fight to the finish.

(J. M. B.)

WHAT READERS ARE SAYING

The following comments concern the April issue of our magazine:

From N. C., "I am somewhat troubled about the change that has been made with the 'The Faith and Southern Baptists.' I have always enjoyed every copy that I have ever received and felt that it was doing more to inform Southern Baptists about the apostasy that is taking place than any other paper. . . . I appreciate fully Brother Bulman's stand on Baptist Church autonomy, but that is not the only thing that is wrong, and it seems to me that he is straddling the fence and giving off an uncertain sound about the things that have caused the question of church autonomy to come up. So far I have not heard him mention the modernism and other heresies in our colleges and seminaries, and perhaps he will advocate people going right on and supporting all those things that are as rotten as can be. . . . I hope that the message 'The Faith and Southern Baptists' has been sounding out will not be hushed in 'The Faith and Free Press'."

Also from N. C., "I have been a subscriber to both papers. Since both papers were fighting for the same thing, it seems good to have them combined."

From Louisiana, "I hate to lose 'The Faith and Southern Baptists.' I do hope 'The Faith and Free Press' will carry on the fight against communism, liberalism, and the apostasy (especially S. B. C. apostasy) of our times."

From Ohio, "I like your magazine very much."

From Kentucky, "I do hope that the new magazine will still earnestly contend for the faith as has 'The Faith and Southern Baptists.' It has been through that paper that I have seen the light. It has also helped my mother; in fact, I believe that one more false move by the Convention and she will break with it."

Also from Kentucky, "I have been reading the first issue of 'The Faith and Free Press' and I appreciate it very much. But I notice on page 12 in the book review in your dealing with Noel Smith's brochure that you offer a criticism on chapter 8 especially relative to what was said about Dr. E. A. McDowell and his writing in the *Adult Quarterly* for 1949, which quarterly I have. Now I surely do not go along with Noel Smith in all that he says and does, and his statements in chapter 8 may deserve criticism; but under the present conditions—with so many uninformed and disturbed people scattered all over the Convention, not knowing just who or what is right—I feel that it might have been better to have left off those remarks in the review, at least for the time present. Is God's book verbally inspired? Or is it partly inspired and partly tradition?" (Editor's comment: Our contention has simply been that the Bible's being fully—or verbally—inspired would not do away with the possibility that one of the writers of the Bible might have made use of material that had been handed down from others. The doctrine of full inspiration is mainly concerned with the accuracy of what is written in the Bible, not with the process whereby a writer might have obtained certain information. In 1 Corinthians 1:11 Paul acknowledges that he had received certain information that had been passed on to him through ordinary channels of communication; he states, "For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren, by them which are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you." There would seem to have been no reason for a supernatural communication to be given him concerning such a matter that he could easily be informed of otherwise. Whereas Daniel was in need of a supernatural communication in order to have the course of certain future events brought before his eyes, there would have been no need of such a supernatural communication to acquaint him with such a well-known matter of information as, say, that Nebuchadnezzar was king of Babylon. . . . The editor of this paper has not failed to criticize Dr. McDowell on a matter where it has been felt that McDowell was wrong. But, we are also glad to defend McDowell on a point where it is felt that he has been unjustly attacked.)

From Virginia, "Here are two well-worn dollars for subscription to your paper. I believe with all my heart we need several Baptist periodicals not published by agencies of the state conventions or Southern Baptist Convention. I have read the April issue very carefully and present my personal reactions to it:

"The printing is excellent. Give my congratulations to your printer for choice of type and paper. This is a

most attractive publication from the point of view of a former newspaperman.

"I am concerned about the article regarding Chaplain Hall. I have known Dr. Alfred Carpenter for years. I admire him, and have confidence in his integrity. Did Chaplain Hall make regular reports as requested by the Commission? (Editor's answer: I do not know; but, as Dr. B. J. Murrie asked, Where does the Chaplains Commission get the authority to ask and demand a monthly report of activities of persons that the Commission neither employs or pays?) Were any moral charges brought against him? (Editor's answer: NO charges that he was informed of were brought against him.) Does he now have the necessary ecclesiastical endorsement? (Editor's answer: our understanding is that he has not been given ecclesiastical endorsement by the Chaplains Commission.) Did the ousting of Editor Murrie really come from his questioning of the facts in the Hall case, or were there other far weightier considerations? (Editor's answer: Dr. Murrie's own accusation—which, so far as we know, has never been answered—was that Dr. Carpenter's writing the Illinois state secretary, following Dr. Murrie's question of the facts in the Hall case, "would appear to be deliberate in order to bring pressure on me and was the immediate cause of my enforced resignation".)

"In regards to the controversy over the University Baptist Church, Tulsa, Oklahoma, I cannot agree with you—and it seems you contradict yourself. I was present when the matter was brought up in the Convention in Kansas City and it was THE CONVENTION which voted not to hear Dr. Lewis G. Prince. My position on this is that there was a controversy in Tulsa about the practices of open communion and alien immersion. It was settled (for Tulsa Baptists) by withdrawing fellowship from the church. These practices are not made tests of fellowship in the S. B. C., so why bring a local controversy into a convention meeting. Your argument that Dr. Prince had a right to state his question of personal privilege is without merit. Nothing the Convention had done infringed his personal liberties. Suppose we accept your position, and I have trouble with the deacons of my church. Do I have a right as a messenger to the Convention to lay a local controversy with deacons before the entire Convention? If I do, and every pastor has that right, and the Convention must give each of us time to present our case, how long would the sessions of the Convention continue before necessary business matters could be concluded? I fail to see why the church 'lost its standing' by action of the Convention. The Church continued its relationship with the Convention until by its own action it withdrew its support and affiliated with another Baptist group. (Editor's comment: Concerning our contention that Dr. Prince did have a right to state his question of personal privilege, as the Virginia state paper has pointed out, "Upon examination it will be found that privilege motions, relating to the needs and interests of members, take precedence over all other motions and may even supersede pending business." As is stated by Kerfoot's *Parliamentary Law*, adopted by the Convention By-Laws as the parliamentary authority of the Convention, "To raise a question of privilege one has only to rise and call out: 'Mr. President, I rise to a question of privilege.' He does not have to wait to secure the floor. He may do this even when another has the floor, and without waiting for recognition by the chair. No second is required. This is in the nature of a claim rather than of a motion. The chair will say: 'Please state the question.' The member will then state what the question is which he wishes to raise. This cannot be amended. It cannot be debated." As the Virginia paper has said, "The chair

and the Convention had the right to dispose of the contents of the question of privilege in whatever manner that seemed best, *but the messenger had the right to state his case.*" Certainly, the privileges of democracy may be abused by a messenger, but that is the risk that must be run in having a democracy.)

"The attacks on Professors Stagg, Bowman, Oates, et al smack of witch hunting. . . . I think that college and seminary students can be trusted to separate the chaff from the grain, even as you do in your reservations in recommending the book by Noel Smith."

From N. C., "The approach you are taking shall never 'save' the Southern Baptist people from anything! It will only serve the cause of contentious division and perhaps—and may God forbid!—a final cleavage between the now not-too-serious factions."

Also from N. C., "The Baptist Examiner" (of Ashland, Ky.) and your publication, 'The Faith and Free Press,' are two of the very greatest publications that I get—and I get a lot of them!"

From Louisiana: "In reading 'The Faith and Free Press' I found on page 11 a small article under the caption 'Ecumenical Climbing,' which is a thinly veiled attack on Dr. J. D. Grey. . . . It is with a great deal of regret that I read this article concerning the election of J. D. Grey to the Presidency of The Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches. The article is written with a sense of irresponsibility and disregard for the factual truth that causes one to wonder. . . .

"The facts of the case are simply these: . . . J. D. Grey pulled out of the Council of Churches . . . and so did practically all of the Baptist Churches in New Orleans, with the exception of two, St. Charles and Napoleon Ave. (Some of us) worked to lay out the plans for: one, the killing of The New Orleans Council of Churches, two, the organization of an organism in which Evangelical Christianity must present a united front against the dark forces of the Roman Catholic Church. It was not easy to convince the leaders of the Episcopal, Protestant Methodist Church to do it, but eventually as a result of much work this was accomplished, and The Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches was born along strictly Baptistic lines. The constitution and by-laws of the Federation are the same by-laws and constitution of a Baptist Association. The Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches is not affiliated with the Council of Churches at home or abroad and it never will be. Furthermore it is not a Federation of Denominations but of single, individual sovereign churches. There are no doctrinal issues in the Federation. . . .

"Now a word as to the speaker of the annual meeting at which Dr. Grey was elected. Bishop William C. Martin was not invited because he is the former president of the Council of Churches. He was invited simply because he is the Methodist bishop next to this diocese. If the one that wrote the article in 'The Faith and Free Press' had taken the trouble to find out what Bishop Martin had said in his address that night, he would very easily have learned that the main burden of the message was this: One, he acknowledged that there are many things that the churches can do better within their own denominations; second, there are many things that the churches and the Christian people can do better if they cooperate together in those areas that will not involve any doctrinal entanglements or compromises. Not a word was ever mentioned of any ecumenical movement or tendency, or trend.

"You can therefore readily see why this article is unfair, uncharitable and what is worse—untrue. . . . (Those editing the paper) proceeded to smear an or-

ganization, and a man, without realizing the grave injustice they were doing, not only to the organization and to the man, but—what is far more important—to the very cause that they so loudly and boisterously claim to champion and to defend. . . . Not only will I not subscribe to the paper but I will not recommend it to any one." (Editor's comment: The complete article, entitled "Ecumenical climbing," to which objection has thus been taken, was as follows: "Dr. J. D. Grey, former president of the S. B. C., and pastor of the First Baptist Church, New Orleans, was elected as president of the Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches at their 11th annual meeting, Feb. 22nd, according to the N. O. *Times Picayune*. It is rather fitting that at this same meeting the principal speaker was Bishop William C. Martin, former president of the National Council of Churches. It is practically certain that Dr. Grey is now a candidate for the presidency of the Baptist World Alliance." We are glad to receive the interpretation that the Greater New Orleans Federation of Churches operates "along strictly Baptistic lines".)

From Missouri: "I want to tell you how much I enjoy 'The Faith and Free Press.' Keep up the good work! You have surely 'come to the kingdom for such a time as this!' ◊

From Tennessee: "Does local autonomy mean that one group has a right to take property that was dedicated for cooperative work and use it for non-cooperative work? I have yet to find anyone who would give a satisfactory answer to this." (Editor's comment: Naturally, it is not claimed that majority action can violate a trust or any condition with respect to the use of the property as has been clearly set forth in the instrument conveying the title to the property, nor that majority action can violate any requirement as has been clearly set forth in the church's constitution. However, local autonomy means that a majority is free to determine its own course whenever its decision would not involve a breach of trust or a violation of what is required in its own constitution. Therefore, unless a church has bound itself, either in accepting a condition of trust or in adopting a constitutional requirement, to continue its "cooperative work," then as an autonomous body it is free to discontinue this "cooperative work;" otherwise it would not be an autonomous body.)

From N. C., "I know that it is a sin to let the Cooperative Program have one cent of my money to propagate its many evils, but there are some dark places in my mind as to other objects in the S. B. C. Would you please clear up the following in 'The Faith and Free Press': If I designate to a missionary that is out under the Convention, does he get this amount over and above the salary which the Convention pays him, or is it counted on his salary so that in the end it just helps the Cooperative Program? Can I send money through the S. B. C. in any channel, designated to any object, that in the end will not support the Cooperative Program?" (Editor's comment: there are a number of things that we could say in providing an answer for this question; however, we are not at the moment in possession of as much information as would be desired in giving a satisfactory answer. Investigation is being made along this line, and we expect to have an article soon dealing at some length with the subject.)

The Question of Racial Integration

Advocacy of racial integration, if but faintly discernible in the quarterly literature of the Sunday School Board of the Southern Baptist Convention, is set forth openly in certain publications of *The Christian Life Commission* of the Southern Baptist Convention. An example of such advocacy on the part of The Christian Life Commission is the following, from a pamphlet entitled "Integration", written by Professor T. B. Maston, of Southwestern Seminary:

"... struggle over the Supreme Court decision is not only a social and political struggle but a moral and spiritual one of major proportions. . . .

"In the area of education, transportation, and elsewhere there developed the theory of separate but equal, which really meant in practice separate but unequal. The 'separate but equal' doctrine did not make its appearance in the Supreme Court until 1896, in a case that involved transportation rather than education. 'American courts have since labored with the doctrine for over half a century.' Six cases, involving the separate but equal doctrine as applied to education, were passed on by the Supreme Court previous to May of 1954. A passing acquaintance with those cases would reveal a gradual breaking down of the separate but equal theory. The action of the Court in May, 1954, was the natural, the almost inevitable climax of preceding decisions. The validity of the separate but equal doctrine, which was a part of the whole caste structure, started to crumble when the courts in the 1930's and particularly the Supreme Court began to give preferential treatment to civil rights rather than to property rights.

"The entire controversy in recent years regarding civil rights has provided some of the background for the Supreme Court decision and the elimination of legal segregation. The Civil Rights Committee, appointed by President Truman, recommended in its report of 1947 'the elimination of segregation, based on race, color, creed, or national origin, from American life.' It further added that the separate but equal doctrine had failed. . . .

"We should accept the Supreme Court decision as the law of the land. . . .

"Furthermore, we should acknowledge that the Supreme Court could not have decided otherwise if it was going to conform to the Constitution. Also, we should admit that the

decision is in harmony with our democratic concepts and with the principles of the Christian religion. . . .

"As law-abiding citizens, Christians should also attempt to create an atmosphere that would make it possible for school boards and school administrators to comply with the instructions of the Supreme Court. We should also be defenders of our public schools, refusing to be a party to their destruction or liquidation. . . .

"While recognizing the difficulty of achieving so-called integration and while agreeing that we must be patient with one another and with what some of us consider very slow progress in certain sections, yet there should not be any hesitation about agreeing that the contemporary race problem is basically a Christian problem. We cannot evade our responsibility by saying that it is political and should not be considered from the Christian viewpoint. . . .

"... a frank recognition of the application of fundamental Christian principles to the area of race relations will maintain a constant and wholesome tension toward the Christian ideal. It may be that some conscientious Christians will defend segregation for the time being. This itself will not do any particular damage so long as they will recognize that the segregation pattern is out of harmony with the spirit and the teachings of the Bible, particularly as revealed in the life and ministry of Jesus. We must insist that an imperfect and an incomplete application of those ideals must never be defended as the final expression of the Christian spirit in human relations (emphasis supplied).

"Finally, our churches and our church related institutions and agencies should face up to the full implications of the Supreme Court decision. We need to adjust our racial ethic to conform to the Christian message as well as to conform to the Supreme Court decision. We have certainly done this to some degree by the excellent statement made at St. Louis in 1947 and in our approval of the Supreme Court decision by the Southern Baptist Convention in 1954. However, a pronouncement is one thing and its practical application in the local church, community, and in the Baptist fellowship in general is quite another thing. It is acknowledged that in this area we may need to go slowly and carefully, but we do need to recognize that our practice is far below the Christian ideal. There should be a continuing tension within our churches growing out of

our failure to accept the full demands of original Christianity with its ethic of the cross. There likewise should be a constant movement toward that Christian ideal in our lives and in the world. The church should truly be the church."

The editor of this paper has not seen anything written by a Baptist in opposition to integration that has handled the subject so well as has a Presbyterian, the late Professor C. K. Brown, of Davidson College, Davidson, N. C., in a pamphlet entitled "The Southern Position With Respect to the Bi-Racial System." This pamphlet publishes what was said by Professor Brown in an address to the students of Davidson College on March 1, 1956. We are informed that the copy of the address was sent to the N. C. Baptist state paper, *Biblical Recorder*, with the request that it be published—which request was denied.

The larger portion of his article is as follows:

"In a time when much is being said about oppressed minorities, it is well to remember that the white people of the South are a minority in the nation. They are not an aggressive minority. They do not seek to impose their pattern of life upon the people of other regions. They are willing to concede to other regions the degree of freedom that they would like to have to establish social arrangements, not inconsistent with the basic law to which they have assented, within their own bounds. For at least a century the South has struggled to retain the degree of local autonomy to which it feels entitled under the American system of government. . . .

"For some years now the South has been subjected to heavy pressure to abandon its bi-racial social structure. This pressure has been applied by the federal government, which, in the words of the *Charlotte News* (editorial of Nov. 26, 1955), has undertaken 'a monumental project in the field of social engineering'; by the N.A.A.C.P., which is determined to exploit the federal power to the utmost in establishing relationships that are obnoxious to the overwhelming majority of the white people of the South; by the northern press, which is almost unanimous in its conviction that the South should be prodded into accepting the ideas of other sections, because, as the editor of *Harper's Magazine*, for example, believes, the white people of the South don't do anything without being prodded (Jan. 1956, p. 24); and by a small group of white persons in the South, who, chiefly on religious grounds, consider the bi-racial system to be a relic of a benighted past.

"In the course of this campaign many intemperate things have been said and done; things that were calculated to infuriate the white South. The Southern people have been called prejudiced, unenlightened, undemocratic, and unchristian. These intemperate attacks have evoked a number of intemperate responses from the less disciplined members of the Southern community. The result is that a tremendous amount of ill-will and resentment has been generated, not only between blacks and whites, but between members of the white race who hold different views on this troublesome subject. If this atmosphere continues, the issue that has been forced upon the South may find no acceptable solution in our time. I am convinced that there are, among the white people of the South, as many persons with a sense of decency, with a love for fair dealing, and with an understanding of the Christian teaching as are to be found in any group of comparable size elsewhere in the country. These are the people who in the end will have to solve this problem. Their task is being made much more difficult by their antagonists, who seem to regard them as deficient in all the great qualities of heart and mind.

There Are Racial Differences

"The South recognizes the race problem as one of the greatest magnitude. It does not regard it as arising simply out of the prejudices of men of different color. It considers race to be a fact, just as sex is a fact. It is not moved by the off-hand assertion that science can discover no differences among races. It holds that there are differences among races, that those differences cannot be eliminated except by amalgamation of blood, that this is not desirable from the viewpoint of any race, and that if two races are to live happily together in the same region, each must know the bounds within which it can function without being offensive to the other. Rules establishing such bounds are to be found in every society containing discreet elements. Some of them are embodied only in custom; some are expressed in the formal requirements of law. The one can be just as compulsory as the other. . . .

"Now the Supreme Court has declared that the Southern states shall no longer embody in their law the boundaries that they have considered it desirable to maintain between the races. . . . The South has bitterly protested this decision as an exercise of power that the federal government does not possess. It finds no language in the constitution to justify such interference in the internal affairs of the states. 'Equal protection of the law,' upon which the court relied, covers the protection of person

and property against the depredations of others. The phrase cannot be stretched to include a right to be educated side by side with other persons who desire to be educated separately. It is no instrument for forcing the association of persons against their will. Under cover of this phrase, however, the court has ruled in effect that people have a vested interest in associating with others whether the others like it or not. Now a vested interest is a right that the state will enforce against all and sundry and without regard to their likes or dislikes. Its purpose is to protect people in the enjoyment of rights already acquired; it can not be employed as a means of bestowing rights.

Psychology Substituted For Law

"Southern opposition to the court's decision cannot be dismissed as disrespect for law. . . . In the South's view, *the court* has shown disrespect for law by basing its decision on a sociological theory that is popular at the moment. The court quotes with approval the finding of a lower court that 'Segregation . . . has a tendency . . . to deprive [Negro children] of some of the benefits they would receive in a racial(ly) integrated school system.' Then the court says: 'Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, this finding is amply supported by modern authority.' (p. 494) *Plessy v. Ferguson* was the 1896 case in which the court held that equal but separate facilities met all the requirements of the law. There is no contention that the law has changed since that time; only that our 'psychological knowledge' has changed. . . .

"Thus lightly does the court turn over the making of law to Social Science Opinion and the writers of books on psychology. And if to one kind of opinion or to one group of writers, why not to another? Some have already insisted that the writers of political textbooks have been consulted. Certain it is that the prestige of the court south of the Potomac is not enhanced when the Vice-President of the United States publicly takes credit, on behalf of his party, for the court's decision. 'Speaking for a unanimous court,' Mr. Nixon is reported to have said, 'a great Republican Chief Justice, Earl Warren, has ordered an end to racial segregation in the nation's public schools.' You may put the commas in that wherever you like but they won't drive the politics out. The phrase 'the

nation's public schools' has a sinister implication. Under the court's decision the schools would no longer be North Carolina's or Georgia's or Mississippi's.

A Compliment To The White Man's Culture

"In its opinion the court held that even though 'buildings, curricula, qualifications and salaries of teachers, and other "tangible" factors' are equal, the Negroes are denied equal opportunity unless they can go to the same schools with white children. In other words, there is no objective test of equality in schools. There is something that the white children bring to their schools that the Negroes cannot bring to theirs. It is nowhere asserted that white children cannot get a good education without attending Negro schools. This is a very clear compliment to the white man's culture. Referring to its own decision in the *Sweatt* case, the court said: '. . . in the finding that a segregated law school for Negroes could not provide them equal educational opportunities, this court relied in large part on "those qualities which are incapable of objective measurement but which make for greatness in a law school."' (p. 493) If one wishes to put the matter that way, one might go on and say that no power on earth can provide the Negroes with equal educational opportunities. What can these immeasurable qualities that make for greatness be, but the sum-total of all that the long history of the white man enables him to bring to the support of his endeavors?

"The court stressed the contention that the members of a minority who must attend separate schools develop a sense of inferiority. But the mere fact of being in a minority does not lead to a sense of inferiority. The Jews are a minority, and they have been subjected to a good deal of social differentiation, but they give no evidence of any feeling of inferiority. On the contrary, they are fully aware of their intellectual powers and their business acumen and are conscious of the proud spiritual heritage that they bear.

"Here we come face to face with a fact that sets limits to anything that we can do in the premises. The Negro in America is in a sense a displaced person. He brought with him to this land only the most primitive type of culture and one that was bound to be obliterated in contact with the advanced civilization of the white man. In these circumstances the Negro could do nothing but appropriate and adapt the white man's culture to the best of his

ability. In this process he has had the sympathetic help of a host of white Southerners, and he will continue to have it. But no man can bestow upon him an inheritance that is not his. . . . Whether he attends mixed schools or separate schools, it will be another's culture that he is striving to appropriate.

Confused Concepts

"The confusion of our age is revealed in the fact that the advocates of mixed schools cite the immeasurable qualities that make for greatness as something that is being withheld from the Negroes, while at the same time they belittle the white man's culture as a thing not worthy of the loyalty of its custodians. On the one hand we are told that Negroes should be allowed a more intimate association in order that they may better acquire what the white man already has; on the other, we are told that the white man's civilization can no longer be seen through the prejudiced eyes of our fathers as having unique qualities that ought to be preserved. The second of these attitudes has been carried to the point where Professor Richard M. Weaver of the University of Chicago can assert that we are an impious people, having lost respect for all that went before us. . . .

" . . . The white man does have a history, and it is not contemptible. Indeed, almost all of recorded history belongs to him. The intellectual power of the Greeks, the organizational skill of the Romans, the spiritual insight of the Hebrews, the music of the Germans, the art of the Italians, the Anglo-Saxon genius for self-government—all of these are a part of his heritage. Modern science is almost wholly his creation; and the Christian religion has, in the Providence of God, been committed to him for propagation. . . .

Society: A Structure With Boundaries

"The white people of the South are, I believe, as eager as any to share the best that we have, (of our culture), but they do not think that this sharing can best be done by submitting their culture to a process of erosion. They think it to the best interest of all to maintain the sort of social barriers that from time immemorial have been the means of preserving cultural and racial integrity. The South, in a word, conceives of human society as a thing having structure, and not as something without form, and void, in which persons are mere economic competitors, having no distinguishing features and bent solely upon increasing their incomes. Modern industrial man has largely lost this sense of structure. The South is on the defensive today because it still retains it.

"Structure implies boundaries that cannot safely be crossed. Such boundaries have long existed between the sexes, although they have become much less formidable in recent years, with results that are not altogether good. There was sound wisdom, for example, in the designation of certain topics that men should not discuss with women. Rules covering such matters were not devised to prove that women are inferior to men, but to improve the quality of the association one with the other. A society with structure must be supported by mutual respect and a mutual spirit of helpfulness on the opposite sides of its boundary lines. It is more dependent upon good manners than it is upon the level of income. It need not be a society without mutual affection. . . .

Christian Brotherhood

"It is not necessary for me to say much about the Christian doctrine of brotherhood. All Christians are indeed brothers in Christ. *'In Christ there is no East nor West.'* But Christian brotherhood implies no sort of equality beyond this, and it certainly sets up no preemptive right of intrusion. It is strange that the concept of brotherhood should be used to describe a condition of worldly equality. Brothers are not equal and cannot be; brotherhood, as Professor Weaver has observed, is status in a family. There are big brother and little brother, each with duties of his own and responsibility to the other. Nowhere in the New Testament can I find that it is the purpose of Christianity to wipe out the differences that exist among men. It deals not with the many points in which they differ, but with the one point in which they are all alike. Some men have black skins, but all have black hearts. In dealing with this common characteristic, Christianity does not destroy the differences of men. It does something grander than that: it makes those differences irrelevant." . . .

[Bold face type indicates supplied emphasis]

DANCING FOR WAKE FOREST

According to the Associated Press, May 13, "The Pilot Mountain Pastors' Conference . . . passed a resolution criticizing a Wake Forest trustees' decision to allow 'supervised' dancing at the school." The *Biblical Recorder* reports that the action of the Wake Forest trustees has been opposed by the Patton Ave. Church, of Asheville, N. C., which has resolved: "If . . . action is not taken by the president, trustees, and the leaders of our convention after a reasonable length of time we do hereby declare that we could then no longer give financial support to these causes." (Editor's comment: But, in the light of the law of N. C. as defined in the *Rocky Mount* case, it just might be that this church could not discontinue its financial support of Wake Forest.)

From The Denominational Press

The Kentucky state paper, the WESTERN RECORDER, is to be commended for publishing, over a period of several months, some important article on doctrinal matters by the Rev. Elvin L. Clark, a Baptist minister of Louisville, Ky. In the issues of that paper of October 18th and 25th, 1956, Clark has two articles entitled, "The Resurrection of Christ: A Modern Reappraisal." The articles are concerned with the doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus Christ as expounded by the well-known modern theologian, Emil Brunner. Clark attempts to compare Brunner's doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus with the teaching of Scripture and our Baptist faith. According to the Scripture, Christ's resurrection was bodily, and this is in accordance with historic Baptist belief—as expressed, for example, in the articles of faith adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention in 1925 which state, "His grave was emptied of its contents."

It is shown that Brunner (and this is characteristic of the "neo-orthodox" approach, of which Brunner is a leading representative) affirms that the resurrection of Christ is of tremendous importance, but gives a "meaning" to the concept of "resurrection" quite different from that of traditional Christianity. Clark states of Brunner's doctrine, "It is when we come to ask the all important question, 'What is the resurrection?' that we find a new doctrine emerging."

Admitting that "it would be incorrect to say that Brunner denies the fact that Christ's tomb was emptied of its contents," Clark shows that, according to Brunner, "*the resurrection must be defined in such a way that the empty tomb has no essential meaning.*" According to Brunner, the "resurrection" of Christ was not really an objective event. Thus, according to Brunner, the "resurrection" is meaningful to faith even if it is to be explained "*as a 'subjective vision' or even as an 'hallucination.'*" According to this, then, the "resurrection" is something "addressed wholly to faith." Clark comments on this:

"Brunner is a master in the use of the half-truth, which, as such is more misleading than full error. With an extreme literalism (which he condemns in the conservatives) he stresses the Biblical statements which say that it is men of faith who are witnesses to the resurrection.

Brunner then concludes that faith and only faith could see the risen Christ.

"Such, however, is not the whole truth. According to Matt. 28:17 some of the disciples doubted that what they saw was really the risen Christ. When Thomas first saw Jesus after the resurrection he was in a condition of doubt, which became faith when he saw. In fact, Jesus told Thomas that he believed because he saw.

"But not only was there doubt in the disciples, there was actual unbelief in some who saw the risen Christ. Brunner says, 'According to the agreed narrative of all the witnesses, the meeting with the Risen Lord was only granted to those who believed in Him. . . .' While it is true that the witnesses to the resurrection were all believers when they bore their witness, *it is not true that they were believers when they first were granted an appearance of Him . . .*

"According to Brunner faith produced the resurrection appearances, but according to the Bible the resurrection appearance produced faith. It is obvious then that we are dealing with two totally different views."

As pointed out by I. W. Rogers in the recent January issue of *The Faith and Southern Baptists*, it would have been very informing to the average Kentucky Baptist had the *Western Recorder* reported that such characteristic teachings of Emil Brunner even find advocacy in Southern Seminary, at Louisville. The editor of *The Faith and Free Press*, having written his doctoral dissertation at Southern Seminary on the subject of Emil Brunner's theology, is prepared to say that Mr. Rogers has correctly represented the situation with regard to the teaching of neo-orthodoxy at Southern Seminary.

In the March issue of the *Southern Baptist Free Press* there was an article attempting to explain something of the importance of the associational missionaries as links in the chain of authority exercised by the Southern Baptist denominational system. In the light of that article, it may be interesting to note the following from an article by Mr. Courts Redford in the April, 1957, issue of *HOME MISSIONS*:

"We have come to appreciate the place of the associational missionary in the growth of our total missionary program. He is one of our most important denominational servants.

"He is important because of his close contact with the churches. The association is the smallest denominational unit. It is closer to the churches than any of our other boards or agencies. For this reason the associational missionary has a contact with the churches which no other denominational worker can possibly have. . . .

"He is important, because of his position, in helping needy churches. There are always churches which need special help. Some may be pastorless, some may be divided, some may have divisions that threaten their spiritual welfare, some may be indifferent and only partially enlisted in the work of the denomination. The associational missionary is in a unique position to help enlist these churches and to serve those who need a special ministry. In many cases he can assist the churches in selecting co-operative pastors; he can help in their special programs; he can encourage each church to participate in the total program of the denomination.

"He is important because of his opportunity to promote all kingdom interests. He can help in Schools of Missions, in simultaneous revivals, in associational training schools, and in other emphases of the various phases of our denominational life. He should assist in the promotion of stewardship and our new program of finance for Southern Baptists. In fact, the good associational missionary tries to get the church and the membership to participate in every worthwhile Christian ministry.

"He is important because he is the best connecting link between the church and the various denominational agencies. He tries to help every denominational worker to understand the needs and the opportunities of his field and to give such support as he can to the churches within his association."

Seminary trained Baptist, now in full time pastorate in the North, available for service in the South—as Pastor, Associate Pastor, or Educational Director.

Conservative in theology and experienced in all phases of Christian service.

May be contacted by writing to this paper — "The Faith and Free Press."

ITEMS IN BRIEF . . .

Following Dr. H. C. Goerner's resignation as Managing Editor of the theological quarterly published by Southern Seminary, the *Review and Expositor*, Dr. Guy H. Ranson has been chosen to serve in that capacity. Dr. Goerner has recently been appointed as area secretary for the Foreign Mission Board of the S. B. C. (It was under Dr. Goerner's editorship, begun five years ago, that the *Review and Expositor* encouraged in a noticeable way a considerable measure of freedom of discussion in its pages. The apparent change in this policy in recent months has been such as to make one wonder if Dr. Goerner has not had to work under rather heavy restraint imposed from higher quarters.) . . . Following the protest of some ministers against the scheduled appearance at Louisiana College of a speaker who had appeared in a national liquor advertisement, the college trustees issued a report expressing "continued confidence as to the character, ability, and quality of leadership" of College President Dr. G. Earl Guinn. According to the *Charity and Children*, "Two factions have been at odds with each other about the college's policies and administration." . . . Since the report, referred to in the May issue of *The Faith and Free Press*, of a study group organized by the American Cancer Society and other health agencies which stated that cigarette smoking causes lung cancer, the Scientific Advisory Board of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee issued a statement denying that there is sufficient evidence for the claim that cigarettes cause lung cancer. As reported by the Associated Press, Dr. Clarence C. Little, board chairman, said: "In advising and educating the public, we believe that scientists should be as cautious today in accepting a claim that a cause has been found for cancer, as they have found it wise to be in the past in accepting a claim of a cure for cancer." . . . In having its degrees licensed by the State of North Carolina in an action recently taken by the State Board of Education, Piedmont Bible College has become the first Bible College to receive recognition by the State of North Carolina. . . . The American Baptist Association, which perpetuates what has been known as "Landmark" theology in that it is an organization composed of churches (in contrast to the S. B. C., which is an organization distinct from the churches and composed of messengers from the churches), will have its annual meeting in Fresno, California, June 25-27. The organization is mainly composed of churches from Arkansas and Texas.

THE ASSOCIATIONAL MISSIONARY AND THE STATE SECRETARY

By H. M. Hocutt

(Editor's note: The editor has received the following for publication from a friend and neighboring minister, the Rev. H. M. Hocutt, pastor of Oakdale Baptist Church, Spencer, N. C., and a member of the Board of Directors of the N. C. Baptist state paper, the *Biblical Recorder*. We are happy to print this defense of Dr. M. A. Huggins' policy in reference to the office of associational missionary. Readers of this article might be interested in what is printed in the column *From the Denominational Press*, in this issue, concerning the office of associational missionary, from an article which originally appeared in the magazine of the Home Mission Board.)

In the March issue of *Southern Baptist Free Press* there is an article by C. K. Rand on "How Does the Machine Operate?", in which is the following paragraph:

But how does the State Secretary place a man in the pastorate? Well, to what source does a church most often look in seeking information concerning a prospective pastor? Does the church not look to the associational missionary? The associational missionary's salary is usually paid—a considerable part at least—out of the cooperative program funds, and thus he will be expected to report to the State Secretary all that goes on in the association. Where could you find a better "spy"? When a church is looking for a pastor in that association, then the State Secretary, through the good offices of his associational missionary, can usually place his man in the pulpit. And of course, nobody is going to shoot Santa Claus.

I would like to give simply as a matter of fact for what it may be worth my experience in this connection. I was the associational missionary in the Buncombe Association, Asheville, N. C., for a little over ten years, December 1, 1944 through April 30, 1955. During those ten years, on NO occasion did our State Secretary seek through the offices of the associational missionary to place any man in any church in the Buncombe Association. In fact, I do not recall having received any letter from our State Secretary even suggesting that I seek to place any man in any church within the association or elsewhere.

Concerning the matter of reports made to the State Secretary concerning "all that goes on in the association," let me say that I did send to our State Secretary each month a report. That report consisted of the names of the

churches where I had worked, meetings I had attended, etc. There was no place on the blank for any information about "all that goes on in the association," and I made no such report. No such report was ever requested. I have a copy of each of my reports, with the exception of perhaps one or two; and if it will be of any help to anybody, they may be seen.

I have been in the ministry for thirty years, and at no place have had any more freedom or liberty than I had while I tried to serve as associational missionary in the Buncombe Association. Our State Secretary was not my boss. At no time did he or anyone else try to tell me what I must do. Instead, he was a friend and a helper. I thank God for him.

URGENT CABLE from HUNGARY'S HEBREW-CHRISTIANS

Our missionary in Budapest has cabled:

WE ASK FOR FOOD, CLOTHES AND MONEY. THE LATTER MAY BE TRANSMITTED ONLY TELEGRAPHICALLY.

To most non-Jews in Hungary, Hebrew-Christians are Jews. To the Jews they are Christians and apostates. They receive little benefit, therefore, from the world's response to Hungary's need for material relief.

Through our missionary we are able to channel help to Hungary's Hebrew-Christians from the only source to which they can look—the Christians of America with a heart burden for the Jews. Without that help their plight can only become steadily worse.

Write today to:

Dr. Jacob Gartenhaus, President
Rev. Robert G. Lee, Ph.D.,
Chairman, Advisory Council



IBJM INTERNATIONAL BOARD
OF JEWISH MISSIONS, INC.
Box 1256 Atlanta 1, Ga.

Ask for free sample copy of our quarterly magazine,
THE EVERLASTING NATION (subscription, \$1 a year).

ROGERS REFLECTIONS

(By I. W. Rogers, Associate Editor,
3511 Clinton Road, Paducah, Ky.)

Brother Paul Calley, missionary to Brazil under Baptist Faith Missions, and his wife, came to Western Kentucky and spent about two weeks, speaking to about 14 churches. They spent one week with our home as their headquarters. These faithful servants of the Lord were a blessing wherever they went, and especially to Mrs. Rogers and me. The churches they visited had their souls stirred concerning the great needs and opportunities in Brazil, and I feel sure that this will result in larger contributions to the work of Baptist Faith Missions. Brother and Sister Calley have their headquarters in Cruzeiro de Sul (Southern Cross) in the Acre territory, 3600 miles from the mouth of the Amazon, and within a few miles of the Peruvian border. They travel up and down the rivers of this vast territory in a house boat, stopping wherever they can gather a group of people, and giving them the everlasting Gospel of the Son of God, winning them to Christ and founding churches. The Lord has been with Brother Calley, and he has won many of these people to the Lord, and some churches have been established during the approximately three years they have labored there. Brother Calley can say with Paul, "so have I strived to preach the gospel, not where Christ was named". (Rom. 15:20) Many of the people where he preaches have never heard the gospel before, and some never even heard of Jesus Christ. There is no other Baptist missionary, or any other kind, that is going to these out-of-the-way places. He is the sole messenger of the cross in hundreds of square miles of territory and among thousands of people. Truly, he is planting the gospel in virgin soil.

For further information about the work of Baptist Faith Missions, write: Pastor H. H. Overbey, Secretary, 1210 East Grand Blvd., Detroit 11, Mich.

And what does the handwriting on the wall mean? It usually means that there are little boys and girls in the family.

The Catholic pope said: "It is absolutely unlawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, of worship"—Pope Pius XIII.

Some Baptist "popes" seem to feel somewhat the same way about it.

"Thy will be done". I was stopping in a hotel in Louisville recently, and the elevator operator was telling me about his use of tobacco. He said he used to chew, but decided to switch to smoking, and wished now he had stuck to chewing, and left off smoking. I asked him why he did not leave off both. He said, "That was probably the will of the Lord, but not my will." That is the trouble with so many people. They say, "My will be done" instead of "Thy will be done,"—or least they act it, if they do not say it.

T-u-l-i-p. At this writing some beautiful tulips are blooming near the door of our office. This reminds me of the principal points of Calvinism. Using the letters in the word, **tulip**, as initial letters we have the five principal points of Calvinism as follows: T—Total depravity; U—Unconditional election; L—Limited Atonement; I—Irresistible Grace; P—Preservation, or Perseverance of the Saints. All Baptists are Calvinistic. But not all Baptists believe all that Calvin said, and certainly they do not endorse all that he did. The sole criterion for the faith and practices of Baptists is the Bible. But, some so-called Baptists seem to put the tenets of Calvinism in the place of the Word of God. One dear brother wrote me that he would not subscribe to the magazine unless I would subscribe to all five points of Calvinism. Well, I did not subscribe; and he has not subscribed. Some of these dear brethren who are such sticklers for the whole of Calvinism, will hardly fellowship anyone else who will not gulp down all that Calvin said. It seems to me that, to make the thing complete, they ought to also endorse all that Calvin did. For instance, Calvin had Servetus put to death for heresy. Will these brethren endorse that?

Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, Texas, in his address, April 14th, at the dedication of a monument to former Vice President Alben W. Barkley in Paducah, said, among other things, "Christianity is in the gravest danger it has been in twenty centuries." He had particular reference to the threat of Communism.

Extra copies of *The Faith and Free Press* may be had in any quantity at the rate of

5 cents per copy, so long as they last. Address, I. W. Rogers, 3511 Clinton Road, Paducah, Ky.

Decisions or Disciples? An excellent guest editorial by Merle Fuller in the May first *Alliance Weekly* closes with the following paragraphs, which, it seems to me, strike at the very root of our present-day troubles:

"God does not need Hollywood crowds or signs and wonders to prove Himself. The critical need today is for young preachers who will find God and obey Him, not use Him to get somewhere. Oh, may our prayer daily be to know God, to love Him, to surrender to Him and to obey Him. Then as we go out to serve, we'll go as men dead at the cross. We'll offer our bodies as living sacrifices and bear the reproach. The insults of wicked flesh will not grieve our pride, ego or pampered feelings. All of this will be reckoned dead. We will go as John the Baptist and preach truth. We may lose our heads but we shall hear His 'well done.'

"I am convinced that much of our modern-day preaching and evangelical activity is presenting a false Jesus. Preachers have gushed and carried on glorified religious vaudevilles; they have been jokers instead of pray-ers. They have appealed to the flesh, and the grieved Holy Spirit could not glorify the Christ of God's Word. Young people have come to altars grinning, unbroken, with unbent wills. Holy Ghost repentance has been almost unknown. Godly sorrow for sin has been ruled out, and easy, intellectual beliefism has been substituted. Our hero-worshiping generation has come to stand in front of a Jesus who has been sold down the river with a program of slush and gush that must make our forefathers toss in their graves.

"I read that when Moses saw God, he fell on his face. When Nehemiah caught a glimpse of the knowledge of God, he wept. Isaiah cried with soul devotion, 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord.' Paul went blind on the Damascus road when he saw the Lord Jesus. John fainted as dead when he saw Him while on Patmos.

"When our Lord Jesus Christ is presented in truth He may not appeal to the thousands, but purity, holiness and soul devotion may be restored. We may not have so many professions, but we'll have possessions. We may not have decisions, but we will have disciples."

Refugee clergymen to speak. According to a press release from the American Council of

Christian Churches meeting in Jacksonville, Fla., in April, eight refugee clergymen and churchmen from Iron Curtain countries will be on a seven weeks tour of this country before this issue reaches the mails. These leaders are from Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Hungary, the Ukraine, and Slovakia. They represent Baptists, Lutherans, Methodists and Reformed Churches.

This is the first tour of its kind ever arranged. The ACCC adopted a resolution calling upon the Christian public to welcome and to heed the messages from this refugee team. These eight religious leaders are eye-witnesses of the afflictions of Christian brethren enslaved by Communism.

This team is in striking contrast to the teams sent out from Russia under the direction and permission of the head of the Russian secret police about a year ago, some of whom spoke to the meeting in Kansas City of the Southern Baptist Convention. Will the leaders of the Convention invite some of these refugee leaders to speak at its meeting in Chicago the latter part of May? I predict they will not.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F. B. I., has reported that there were more crimes committed in 1956 than in any other year in American history. There was a striking increase in juvenile crime. Will this trend ever stop? I do not believe it will so long as little children are fed on crime and more crime by television programs. Will America wake up before it is too late?

John C. Hedrick, D. D.

Baptist Evangelist

Available for Revival Meetings

22 years experience as Pastor-Evangelist

Radio Preacher

Fundamental—Pre-Millennial—True To The Bible
Contending For The Historic Baptist Faith

In No Sense A Believer In Unionism

Has had pastorates in Virginia, Kentucky,
West Virginia, Tennessee, Missouri

Revival Campaigns in above mentioned states, also
in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Illinois, New Jersey, Indiana,
Maryland, North Carolina, Arkansas

For Open Dates,

Write: John C. Hedrick, D.D.

Box 93

Campbell, Missouri

WHAT IS THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION?

Buell H. Kazee

(Editor's Note: In the following article submitted for publication in this magazine by Mr. Buell H. Kazee, of Lexington, Ky., some criticisms are made regarding the basic organizational structure of the S. B. C. The editor would welcome an article giving a critical appraisal of Mr. Kazee's argument.)

Years ago this writer wrote an article (published in the *Western Recorder* and other religious papers) entitled, "Has the Denomination Swallowed the Churches?" Even then we were wondering if this had happened. Imagine our feeling at this time!

Recent developments of a legal nature in church affairs have led us to investigate and try to determine just exactly what THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION is. *By its own definition*, there is no such thing as the SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION except when the "messengers" from different cooperating churches are meeting in organized session.

Constitution, Article I, says: "The name of this body (which body?) is the 'Southern Baptist Convention'." This assumes either (1) that there is a group of messengers meeting in organized assembly and that it adopts this as the name for that body then in session, or (2) that there began at the first adoption of this name and that there is perpetuated through the years an organization of that name.

Constitution, Article III. *Membership*. "The Convention shall consist of messengers who are members of missionary Baptist churches co-operating with the Convention (what convention?) as follows:" (Here the basis of membership is set forth). In the third part of the definition of membership or "messengers" the article states: "The messengers shall be appointed and certified by the churches to the Convention . . .".

Now, it is well known that each co-operating church (co-operating with what? The Convention! What Convention?) elects its messengers for a particular annual meeting of "the Convention", and it is absolutely understood that when that particular session of "the Convention" has terminated the "messengers" so appointed have finished their term of "office". Who, then, constitutes "the Convention" after the session is over? The article definitely states that the "Convention shall consist" of these church-appointed messengers, and when the

messengers have met and formed and participated in the meeting which they called "the Convention" and into which they constituted themselves at that particular meeting, who, then, constitutes "the Convention" when the meeting is over?

Now let it be observed that all the statements made in the Constitution and By-laws of "the Convention" are stated as if the Convention were a permanent, year-to-year organization, constituted with active officers for the entire year, yet, *according to its own definition*, there is no Convention except during the meeting of the "messengers" selected by the churches for this particular session. Thus "the Convention" is true to the term by which it is called, and each separate, annual meeting is not "a meeting of the Convention", as is so often stated, but is a *Convention* in and of itself. Since there are no constituent members (messengers) of "the Convention" on a year-to-year basis, there is no Convention until next year when a new group of "messengers" will meet and form *another Convention*. The Convention which met this year, for instance, can adopt a constitution and by-laws only for that session, and it can in no way bind the next Convention to any action it may take. To summarize, the Convention is a meeting of "messengers" and not an organization of perpetual existence. It can have no power of action beyond recommendation, and it can bear no responsibility beyond the date of the meeting.

The *Constitution and By-laws* goes on to provide for boards, committees, and agencies "of the Convention" as if it were a perpetual organization. If any legal test should come as to the action of "the Convention", who could be responsible? It is true that "the Convention" has provided itself an "Executive Committee" (By-law 9) which it (the Convention) says "shall be the fiduciary, the fiscal, and the executive agency of the Convention in all its affairs not specifically committed to some other board or agency," that "it is specifically authorized, instructed, and commissioned to perform the following functions: (a) To act for the Convention ad interim in all matters not otherwise provided for. (b) To be named in transfers of real and personal property for the use and benefit of the Convention either by deed, conveyance, will, or otherwise and to affix the seal of the Convention (which convention?) to all approved transactions . . .".

Here the Executive Committee becomes the legal officers of the Convention. This can be said of trustees of a church which is a perpetual organization, but how can the Committee be

the legal holders of title for a convention which does not exist?

In the legal proceedings wherein churches have been found to be out of accord with the Southern Baptist Convention or a state association, we wonder just which convention is meant. Every meeting of the messengers from the churches is a convention within itself, and each year there is a new convention. How can one be in or out of such body unless one is speaking wholly of the meeting itself? How can the Southern Baptist Convention own and control so much property, set up so many abiding fiats and resolutions and set up machinery and place men in responsible positions to carry on five year programs, or even one year programs, when the Convention itself is over and disbanded as soon as the meeting is closed? These questions press for answer in the light of the Convention's own statement of its constitution.

BOOK REVIEWS

Letters to the Seven Churches. By Joseph A. Seiss, Baker Book House, \$2.75.

Dr. Seiss is one of the truly great writers on the book of Revelation, being author of *The Apocalypse*, one of the very best commentaries on Revelation to be found anywhere. The *Letters to the Seven Churches* is a series of lectures covering the first three chapters of Revelation. Many pastors — or probably I should say, most pastors—should make a re-study of the Seven Churches of Asia in the light of present-day conditions. Most writers on matters religious refer often to "The Church", but most of them could not satisfactorily define what they mean by the terms. But, all of them must admit that the seven churches of Asia described in Rev. 2 and 3 are local churches. Christ is described as the One who walks "in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks", meaning the seven local churches. Our Lord has not promised to walk among any kind of churches except local churches. Hence, the importance of a re-study of these seven local churches. The author's keen spiritual insight and gift of clear expression of his ideas are evident on every page. This book is a must for every one who would make a thorough re-study of this portion of the book of Revelation.

(I. W. R.)

Northwoods Romance. By Craig Massey, Zondervan Publishing House, \$2.50.

The author is pastor of a church in Altoona, Pa., and has written many articles for publi-

cation in religious journals, but this is his first full-length novel. The scene is laid in the northern part of the American colonies during the Revolutionary War, a period on which the author is an authority.

Grey Adams, a devout and sincere young preacher of the gospel, falls in love with Susan Cherry, several years younger than he. Before he makes known his love to her, the Indians make a raid on the nearby settlement where Susan lived, and she is carried away captive. Grey disguises himself as an Indian and, after many dangerous and thrilling experiences, succeeds in rescuing Susan, and bringing her back home. The strong Christian faith of both Grey and Susan is the one element that sustains them through their harrowing experiences. It would be difficult to find a more gripping, thrilling and wholesome story than this one, for both young and old.

(I. W. R.)

Mabel Clement. By J. M. Sallee, Economy Printers, \$2.00.

This is a discussion, in story form, of the differences between the followers of Alexander Campbell and the Baptists, the heroine of the story being Mabel Clement. It also goes on to show the Biblical basis of all the great doctrines which Baptists hold dear. I know of no other book that brings out so clearly and interestingly the great distinctive doctrines of Baptists.

(I. W. R.)

Doctors' Choice. Published by Wilfred Fund, Inc., and edited by Phyllis and Albert Blaustein.

This is an anthology of sixteen stories, each one dealing with some phase of the medical profession, and each one recommended by one or more eminent doctors. Some of the best known of these stories are: *Rab and His Friends* by John Brown; *The Enemy* by Pearl Buck; *The Vanishing Lady*, by Alexander Woolcott; and "*Speaking of Operations*" by Irvin S. Cobb. All the stories here are probably very interesting to those in the medical profession, and many of them are very interesting to the average layman. But I cannot recommend the book for the following reason: In some of the stories there are drinking scenes cunningly worked in with evident approval.

(Not in stock at The Faith Book House.)
(I. W. R.)

Unless otherwise indicated, all books reviewed in this magazine are for sale by The Faith Book House, 3511 Clinton Road, Paducah, Ky.